



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,536	12/12/2003	John Gerlock	FMC 1634 PUS / 202-0172	2715
28395	7590	01/25/2006		EXAMINER
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C./FGTL 1000 TOWN CENTER 22ND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075-1238				DANIELS, MATTHEW J
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1732
				DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/735,536	GERLOCK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Matthew J. Daniels	1732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/12/03.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-18, drawn to methods, classified in class 264, subclass 494.
  - II. Claims 19-20, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 118, subclass 301.
2. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to practice another and materially different process, such as applying a sugar coating to shredded wheat.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, recognized divergent subject matter, and because the search required for group II is not required for group I, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. During a telephone conversation with Matt Jakubowski on 15 December 2005 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-18. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 19-20 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

*Priority*

6. The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

7. The disclosure of the prior-filed application, Application No. 60432973, fails to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this application. The subject matter of Claim 1 pertaining to the relative intensities of the first and second average intensities and the subject matter of Claim 15 pertaining to particular energy densities and wavelengths does not appear to have support in the prior-filed provisional application. Therefore, these claims appear to have the filing date of the instant application, 12 December 2003.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. **Claims 1-8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Sorga (USPN 3943046). **As to Claim 1**, De Sorga teaches a method for curing a UV curable clearcoat composition, the method comprising:

providing an article (7:51-53);  
applying a UV curable clearcoat composition to the article (1:39-63);  
exposing the clearcoat composition to a first light source having a first average light intensity for a first period of time to cure a first part of the composition (4:27-34); and  
exposing the clearcoat composition to a second light source having a second average light intensity for a second period of time (4:31-46) which is sufficient to cure a second portion of the UV curable clearcoat composition, the first and second portions forming a substantially cured clearcoat (3:52-54).

De Sorga appears to be silent to the limitation that the second average light intensity is less than the first average light intensity. However, in this regard De Sorga teaches that the average light intensities required are dependent on the kind of polymerizable vehicle in the film, the thickness, the gaseous atmospheres around the film, the type of sensitizers or other activators, and the wavelength or wavelengths emanated from the ultraviolet source (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). Therefore, De Sorga clearly recognizes the result-effective nature of light intensity in the polymerization process. Light intensity, therefore, represents a result-effective variable which one of ordinary skill would have found it *prima facie* obvious to optimize to arrive at the claimed conditions according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and wavelength used. See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). **As to Claim 2 and 3**, De Sorga teaches the percent and configuration (7:41-46). **As to Claim 4**, see 5:16-22. **As to Claim 5**, the Examiner submits that the particular apparatus limitation claimed does not materially affect the claimed method because the film and method would not be materially changed regardless of what apparatus is used to deliver the same intensity. However, De Sorga additionally teaches lamps that appear to be fluorescent lamps (8:33-45), and the Examiner submits that fluorescent lamps are common and well known in the art for delivering polymerizing ultraviolet radiation. Additional evidence of this position can be found in the methods of Keyl and Takamizawa, found below in the rejections of Claims 9-14 under 35 USC 103(a) below. **As to Claims 6 and 7**, De Sorga clearly teaches the claimed wavelengths as being within the advantageous and preferable range (1:34-38), and the intensity is clearly found to be a result effective variable which the ordinary artisan would have found it obvious to optimize, and arrive at the claimed conditions, according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and

wavelength used (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). **As to Claim 8**, De Sorga clearly recognizes that intensity represents a result effective variable which the ordinary artisan would have found it obvious to optimize, and arrive at the claimed conditions, according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and wavelength used (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

9. **Claims 9-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Sorga (USPN 3943046) in view of Takamizawa (USPN 4359369). De Sorga teaches the subject matter of Claim 1 above under 35 USC 103(a). **As to Claims 9 and 10**, the Examiner submits that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the irradiation time to be a result effective variable in view of De Sorga's teaching of particular conveyor belt speed (8:41) and in order to cause minor polymerization in the skin to a particular depth (7:42-45) and substantially complete polymerization in the second stage (7:37-40). The particular exposure times therefore appear to represent result-effective variables that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to optimize in order to provide a particular degree of skin curing and complete polymerization in the second step. However, in the alternative Takamizawa teaches that the irradiation time required for curing "naturally depends on various parameters" (7:23). Therefore, Takamizawa additionally teaches that the irradiation time is a result-effective variable. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it *prima facie* obvious to optimize this variable to arrive at the claimed conditions. See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Takamizawa into that of De Sorga in order to provide complete curing (Takamizawa, 7:22), a result which De Sorga clearly suggests (7:37-45).

10. **Claims 11, 13, and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Sorga (USPN 3943046) in view of Takamizawa (USPN 4359369) and further in view of Keyl (USPN 3511687). De Sorga and Takamizawa teach the subject matter of Claim 9 above under 35 USC 103(a). **As to Claim 11**, De Sorga clearly teaches the claimed wavelengths as being within the advantageous and preferable range (1:34-38), and the intensity is clearly found to be a result effective variable which the ordinary artisan would have found it obvious to optimize, and arrive at the claimed conditions, according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and wavelength used (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). De Sorga additionally teaches lamp distances of 4 inches (8:15-16, equivalent to 10.2 cm) and 6 inches (8:40, equivalent to 15.24 cm) which appears to render the claimed distance *prima facie* obvious. However, Keyl additionally teaches lamp distances of 2 to 25 inches (8:21, equivalent to 5.08 cm to 63.5 cm), and additionally that the films to be cured should be placed within the “zone of greatest influence of said light source.” (8:12). Therefore, Keyl appears to teach the ordinary artisan that lamp distance is a result-effective variable. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to optimize the lamp distance to place it within the zone of greatest influence of the light source and thereby produce the most rapid curing. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Keyl into that of De Sorga and Takamizawa in

order to provide the most efficient curing by placing the zone of greatest influence of the light source. **As to Claims 13 and 14**, De Sorga clearly teaches a discontinuous and flashing light source having spaced apart flashes of light (3:20-26, 3:55-62, and 2:42).

11. **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Sorga (USPN 3943046) in view of Keyl (USPN 3511687). De Sorga teaches the subject matter of Claim 1 above under 35 USC 103(a). **As to Claim 12**, De Sorga teaches the claimed wavelengths (1:37-38) and additionally recognizes that intensity represents a result effective variable which the ordinary artisan would have found it obvious to optimize, and arrive at the claimed conditions, according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and wavelength used (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). De Sorga appears to be silent to the particular lamp distance. However, this aspect is well known in the art to represent result effective variables that the ordinary artisan would have found it *prima facie* obvious to optimize to arrive at the claimed conditions. In particular, Keyl teaches lamp distances of 2 to 25 inches (8:21, equivalent to 5.08 cm to 63.5 cm), and additionally that the films to be cured should be placed within the “zone of greatest influence of said light source.” (8:12). Therefore, Keyl appears to teach the ordinary artisan that lamp distance is a result-effective variable. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to optimize the lamp distance to place it within the zone of greatest influence of the light source and thereby produce the most rapid curing. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Keyl into that of De Sorga in order to provide the most efficient curing by placing the zone of greatest influence of the light source.

12. **Claims 15-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Sorga (USPN 3943046). As to **Claim 15**, De Sorga teaches a method for curing a UV curable clearcoat composition, the method comprising:

providing an article (7:51-53);

applying a UV curable clearcoat composition to the article (1:39-63);

exposing the clearcoat composition to a first light source having a first average light intensity at 320 nm (1:37) for a first period of time to cure a first part of the composition (4:27-34); and

exposing the clearcoat composition to a second light source having a second average light intensity at 380 nm (1:37) for a second period of time (4:31-46) which is sufficient to cure a second portion of the UV curable clearcoat composition, the first and second portions forming a substantially cured clearcoat (3:52-54).

De Sorga appears to be silent to the particular light intensities. However, in this regard De Sorga teaches that the average light intensities required are dependent on the kind of polymerizable vehicle in the film, the thickness, the gaseous atmospheres around the film, the type of sensitizers or other activators, and the wavelength or wavelengths emanated from the ultraviolet source (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). Therefore, De Sorga clearly recognizes the result-effective nature of light intensity in the polymerization process. Light intensity, therefore, represents a result-effective variable which one of ordinary skill would have found it *prima facie* obvious to optimize to arrive at the claimed conditions according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and wavelength used. See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d

272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). **As to Claims 16 and 17**, De Sorga teaches the percent and configuration (7:41-46), and the first source being a xenon flash lamp (5:16-22). **As to Claim 18**, the Examiner submits that the particular apparatus limitation claimed does not materially affect the claimed method because the film and method would not be materially changed regardless of what apparatus is used to deliver the same intensity. However, De Sorga additionally teaches lamps that appear to be fluorescent lamps (8:33-45), and the Examiner submits that fluorescent lamps are common and well known in the art for delivering polymerizing ultraviolet radiation. Additional evidence of this position can be found in the methods of Keyl and Takamizawa, found above in the rejections of Claims 9-14 under 35 USC 103(a).

13. **Claims 1-8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Sorga (USPN 3943046) in view of Mibu (USPN 4276479). **As to Claim 1**, De Sorga teaches a method for curing a UV curable clearcoat composition, the method comprising:

providing an article (7:51-53);

applying a UV curable clearcoat composition to the article (1:39-63);

exposing the clearcoat composition to a first light source having a first average light intensity for a first period of time to cure a first part of the composition (4:27-34); and

exposing the clearcoat composition to a second light source having a second average light intensity for a second period of time (4:31-46) which is sufficient to cure a second portion of the UV curable clearcoat composition, the first and second portions forming a substantially cured clearcoat (3:52-54).

De Sorga appears to be silent to the limitation that the second average light intensity is less than the first average light intensity.

However, in this regard De Sorga teaches that the average light intensities required are dependent on the kind of polymerizable vehicle in the film, the thickness, the gaseous atmospheres around the film, the type of sensitizers or other activators, and the wavelength or wavelengths emanated from the ultraviolet source (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). Therefore, De Sorga clearly recognizes the result-effective nature of light intensity in the polymerization process. Light intensity, therefore, represents a result-effective variable which one of ordinary skill would have found it *prima facie* obvious to optimize to arrive at the claimed conditions according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and wavelength used. See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Additionally, Mibu teaches a method in which the second average light intensity is less than the first average light intensity (See 2:16-30). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Mibu into that of De Sorga because doing so would produce a smooth and very glossy surface having neither crinkles nor wrinkles, which is tougher and harder than those obtained by conventional methods (Mibu, 6:58-62). **As to Claim 2 and 3**, De Sorga teaches the percent and configuration (7:41-46). **As to Claim 4**, see 5:16-22. **As to Claim 5**, the Examiner submits that the particular apparatus limitation claimed does not materially affect the claimed method because the film and method would not be materially changed regardless of what apparatus is used to deliver the same intensity. However, De Sorga additionally teaches lamps that appear to be fluorescent lamps (8:33-45), and the Examiner submits that fluorescent lamps are common and well known in the

art for delivering polymerizing ultraviolet radiation. Additional evidence of this position can be found in the methods of Keyl and Takamizawa, found below in the rejections of Claims 9-14 under 35 USC 103(a) below. **As to Claims 6 and 7**, De Sorga clearly teaches the claimed wavelengths as being within the advantageous and preferable range (1:34-38), and the intensity is clearly found to be a result effective variable which the ordinary artisan would have found it obvious to optimize, and arrive at the claimed conditions, according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and wavelength used (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). **As to Claim 8**, De Sorga clearly recognizes that intensity represents a result effective variable which the ordinary artisan would have found it obvious to optimize, and arrive at the claimed conditions, according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and wavelength used (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

14. **Claims 9-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Sorga (USPN 3943046) in view of Mibu (USPN 4276479), and further in view of Takamizawa (USPN 4359369). De Sorga and Mibu teach the subject matter of Claim 1 above under 35 USC 103(a). **As to Claims 9 and 10**, the Examiner submits that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the irradiation time to be a result effective variable in view of De Sorga's teaching of particular conveyor belt speed (8:41) and in order to cause minor polymerization in the skin to a particular depth (7:42-45) and substantially complete polymerization in the second stage (7:37-40). The particular exposure times therefore appear to represent result-effective variables that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to optimize in order to provide a particular degree of skin curing and complete polymerization in the second step. However, in the alternative Takamizawa teaches that the irradiation time required for curing “naturally depends on various parameters” (7:23). Therefore, Takamizawa additionally teaches that the irradiation time is a result-effective variable. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it *prima facie* obvious to optimize this variable to arrive at the claimed conditions. See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Takamizawa into that of De Sorga and Mibu in order to provide complete curing (Takamizawa, 7:22), a result which De Sorga clearly suggests (7:37-45).

15. **Claims 11, 13, and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Sorga (USPN 3943046) in view of Mibu (USPN 4276479), Takamizawa (USPN 4359369), and further in view of Keyl (USPN 3511687). De Sorga, Mibu, and Takamizawa teach the subject matter of Claim 9 above under 35 USC 103(a). **As to Claim 11**, De Sorga clearly teaches the claimed wavelengths as being within the advantageous and preferable range (1:34-38), and the intensity is clearly found to be a result effective variable which the ordinary artisan would have found it obvious to optimize, and arrive at the claimed conditions, according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and wavelength used (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). De Sorga additionally teaches lamp distances of 4 inches (8:15-16, equivalent to 10.2 cm) and 6 inches (8:40, equivalent to 15.24 cm) which appears to render the claimed distance *prima facie* obvious.

However, Keyl additionally teaches lamp distances of 2 to 25 inches (8:21, equivalent to 5.08 cm to 63.5 cm), and additionally that the films to be cured should be placed within the “zone of greatest influence of said light source.” (8:12). Therefore, Keyl appears to teach the ordinary artisan that lamp distance is a result-effective variable. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to optimize the lamp distance to place it within the zone of greatest influence of the light source and thereby produce the most rapid curing. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Keyl into that of De Sorga, Mibu, and Takamizawa in order to provide the most efficient curing by placing the zone of greatest influence of the light source. **As to Claims 13 and 14**, De Sorga clearly teaches a discontinuous and flashing light source having spaced apart flashes of light (3:20-26, 3:55-62, and 2:42).

16. **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Sorga (USPN 3943046) in view of Mibu (USPN 4276479), and further in view of Keyl (USPN 3511687). De Sorga and Mibu teach the subject matter of Claim 1 above under 35 USC 103(a). **As to Claim 12**, De Sorga teaches the claimed wavelengths (1:37-38) and additionally recognizes that intensity represents a result effective variable which the ordinary artisan would have found it obvious to optimize, and arrive at the claimed conditions, according to the particular thickness, atmosphere, sensitizer, and wavelength used (3:63-4:2 and 5:9-30). See MPEP 2144.05 II and *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). De Sorga appears to be silent to the particular lamp distance. However, this aspect is well known in the art to represent result effective variables that the ordinary artisan would have found it *prima facie* obvious to optimize

to arrive at the claimed conditions. In particular, Keyl teaches lamp distances of 2 to 25 inches (8:21, equivalent to 5.08 cm to 63.5 cm), and additionally that the films to be cured should be placed within the “zone of greatest influence of said light source.” (8:12). Therefore, Keyl appears to teach the ordinary artisan that lamp distance is a result-effective variable. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to optimize the lamp distance to place it within the zone of greatest influence of the light source and thereby produce the most rapid curing. It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Keyl into that of De Sorga and Mibu in order to provide the most efficient curing by placing the zone of greatest influence of the light source.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Daniels whose telephone number is (571) 272-2450. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Michael Colaianni can be reached on (571) 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJD 1/14/06



  
MICHAEL P. COLAIANNI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER